To: EWP Curriculum Design Team
From: Richard Holman, Greg Cyronek, Mike Markham

April 18, 1997

Distribution

Attached is the report of the Design Meeting for the Enhanced Work Planning training package
held March 25 - 27, 1997. Contributors to this report are myself and Richard Holman.

Sincerely,
J. Greg Cyronek
INEEL Institute
mk
Attachments:
   Attachment 1 - Training Design Team Members
   Attachment 2 - Training Design Plan Courses 1 and 2
   Attachment 3 - Course 1 Video Script
   Attachment 4 - EWP Charter
   Attachment 5 - Assignments

Distribution

LMITCO   DOE-HQ
J. M. Duffy, MS 5304   M. Hillman - DOE-HQ
R. D. Holman, MS 2436   Linda Yost - HQ
M. C. Markham, MS 2436
C. S. Morgan, MS 3103   DOE-ID
L. W. Peterson, MS 2507   John Martin - DOE-ID
G. VonNieda, MS 5220
                                Fernald
Hanford   J. Trujillo
J. Schildknecht
                                Mound
                                J. Yonko

Tulane
P. Farabaugh   Oak Ridge
Liz Langlois   R. Stalliongs
                                L. Tanner

cc: J. G. Cyronek File
        File Code 000

Enhanced Work Planning
Training Design Meeting
March 25-27, 1997
Park City, Utah

A training design meeting for the Enhanced Work Planning Initiative was held March 25-27, 1997, at the Olympia Park Hotel in Park City, Utah. The following individuals attended:

Greg Cyronek - Idaho
Mike Duffy - Idaho
Peggy Farabaugh - Tulane
Mike Hillman - DOE-HQ
Richard Holman - Idaho
Liz Langlois - Tulane
John Martin - DOE-ID
Chris Morgan - Idaho
Loren Peterson - Idaho
Lou Tanner - Oak Ridge
Jim Schildknecht - Hanford
Roy Stalliongs - Oak Ridge
Jim Trujillo - Fernald
George VonNieda - Idaho
Jon Yonko - Mound
Linda Yost - HQ
See attachment 1 for more information on the attendees.

Agenda

Day One-
After initial introductions, an overview of the next three days business was conducted. Rules of conduct for a facilitated discussion were explained and the overall objective of validating and completing an earlier Design Plan outline was covered.

Starting with Course One from the original Design Plan outline, steering committee members were informed that Tulane University would be the prime developers of the actual video, but the actual script content would be developed during this design session. Furthermore, it was pointed out that Course Two would use the same video produced for Course One with the addition of stop points for guided site-specific discussions.

Members of the EWP Steering Committee were first asked to verify and validate the target audience for both Course One and Two. Although there was some concern as to how general the audience for Course One should be, both target audience groupings were left as is.

Next, the steering committee began validating the five objectives associated with Course One. During this process, one objective was added (see attachment 2, new objective four, "Discuss worker involvement in the implementation of EWP.") and the five "principles" or "tenets" governing the successful implementation of EWP had their names changed to the five "elements." Additionally, concerning objective one (EWP's relationship to other DOE initiatives), it was decided to "tie" EWP to Integrated Safety Management as it was felt this was the major driver behind EWP, VPP, and a host of other programs and/or initiatives.

Also, during the discussion, each site attendee was asked to provide lists of personnel at their sites who could be used to speak on the video. Actual topics for each site discussion will be determined by Tulane based on prioritized lists of EWP successes and innovations provided by the attendees. Extra emphasis was placed on using successes and innovations which are 100% verifiable to ensure credibility.

While validating objectives, discussion between all attendees established a much clearer understanding of EWP. It became clear that EWP was <u>not</u> the work but the <u>process</u> by which the work was examined and improved. This discussion was summed up with the development of a simple graphic of the process and the understanding that once the EWP process has been used successfully, it ceases to exist as a process because the means of doing the work has been modified and improved.

Day Two-
The second day began with a presentation of a new design plan outline which incorporated comments and concerns from the previous session. Tulane University representatives also discussed their understanding of the video scripting to date.

Next, the final objectives for Course One were validated and discussion began on Course Two. After validating the target audience, objectives seven, eight, and nine were validated. Although it was agreed the wording of the objectives stood alone as an outline for the site-specific discussion, additional guidance for objectives seven and eight was provided and guidance for objective nine will be provided by Mike Hillman, DOE-HQ.

Day Three-
Tulane University representatives began the session with an updated script for Course one (attachment 3).

The remaining portion of Day three was spent validating the audience and objectives for Course Three and Four. The audience for both courses was determined to be the CORE team(s) from the facility. It was also decided that prior to any further training design meetings of the full steering committee, a "straw man" lesson plan would be provided to all members for review. This "straw man" lesson plan is to be based on the best parts of the existing successful EWP programs. Members were encouraged to send any implementation plans, operating procedures, or other pertinent documentation to Richard Holman (email address: rdh1@inel.gov).

The meeting was concluded with Linda Yost committed to providing a list of requested information to each attendee. All participants agreed the meeting was a success and accomplished more than originally scheduled. No future meeting dates were set.

A follow up conference call to the Park City meeting is scheduled for April 10 at 11:00 A.M Eastern Standard Time. The EWP Steering Committee will meet from 11:00 A.M. to 11:30 A.M. and the Design Team will meet from 11:30 A.M. to Noon. The call in number is 301-903-7080. Final input on the Design Plan will be asked for at that time.

General Comments

Many items were discussed and consensus was reached in many areas where there had been confusion. It was generally agreed that training must become the common catalyst to standardize program philosophy within three separate cultures which exist within DOE concerning EWP, those who have never heard of EWP, those who think they understand EWP at their site, and the members of the EWP steering committee. Finally, the following terms were either deleted or modified to help clear up misunderstandings:

"Tenets" and/or "principles" were universally changed to elements

Workers was changed to workforce

References to terms such as "we must work smarter, harder, etc." were deleted due to the implication we were <u>not</u> working smart or hard already

Emphasize difference between CORE Teams (implementation of EWP) and Work Teams (application of EWP to task).